

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **01 June 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 7, 8, 17 and 26 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 11, 12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on “Post-Maintenance Testing Based on Path Change Analysis”, by Benedusi et al. (hereinafter “Benedusi”). Claims 6, 15, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Benedusi based on Berry et al. (USPN 6,662,359, hereinafter “Berry”).

### **Amendments to the Specification**

Applicant has amended the specification to indicate that Java is trademark. No new matter has been added.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 7, 18, 17, and 26 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 7, 18, 17, and 26 to correct typographical errors.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 11, 12, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claim 11 and 12 to correct antecedent basis. No new matter has been added.

Applicant has incorporated claim limitations from claim 24 into independent claim 19, and therefore has cancelled claim 24 without prejudice (see below).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Benedusi. Applicant respectfully points out that Benedusi discloses identifying a “meaning” of a test case, wherein the meaning is expressed by references to **functionalities and logical coverage** of a test case (see Benedusi page 356, column 1, lines 11-15).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to identifying one or more test cases that are capable of executing the one or more changed paths by **parsing and evaluating names and parameters of one or more methods of a test case** from the plurality of test cases (see paragraph [0064] of the instant application).

Identifying the functionalities and logical coverage of a test case *is not the same* as parsing and evaluating names and parameters of one or more methods of a test case. Specifically, identifying the functionalities and logical coverage of a test case requires low-level analysis of a test case. In contrast, parsing and evaluating names and parameters of one or more methods of a test case is a high-level analysis which can be performed quickly and efficiently.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention identifies one or more test cases that are capable of executing the one or more changed paths by **parsing and evaluating names and parameters of one or more methods of a test case** from the plurality of test cases. These amendments find support in paragraph [0064] of the instant application. Note that Applicant has incorporated claim limitations from claims 5-6, 14-15, and 23-24 into independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectfully. As a result, Applicant cancels claims 5-6, 14-15, and 23-24 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 7-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-13 and 16-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-22 and 25-26, which depend

upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By      /Shun Yao/       
Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 4 September 2007

Shun Yao  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com